DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 691 CS 503 893

AUTHOR McDermott, Virginia; Baker, Deborah
TITLE Toward a Conversational Analysis of Self Disclosure: A Transactional Approach. Revised.
PUB DATE Apr 82
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Central States Speech Association (Milwaukee, WI, April 15-17, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Patterns; *Communication (Thought Transfer); Communication Research; Interaction; *Interpersonal Relationship; *Speech Communication
IDENTIFIERS *Interpersonal Communication; *Self Disclosure

ABSTRACT

Self-disclosure may be viewed through the framework of the role-taking processes by which we come to know ourselves and to be known to others. Because individuals ground utterances contextually, in anticipation of another's responses and according to the prescriptions of the situation itself, self-disclosure is more likely to be flexibly scripted than spontaneous. The definition of a situation is emergent and negotiable; consequently, self-descriptive statements are emergent and negotiable as identity claims within a framework of the shared understanding of the relationship that exists between the dyadic partners. Given a particular context with its attendant cues, the self-disclosure of an interactant can be tracked by examining (1) the level of abstraction of a self-descriptive statement; and (2) the impact of that statement as an identity claim that can be determined by examining the conversation for cues to the relational claim that the interactants make upon each other. By examining the identity claim within the emerging meaning of a conversation we can track in an exploratory fashion the relational claim that is being proffered, accepted, or rejected. This interactive view of disclosing behavior provides a theoretical framework for further research consistent with some fundamental tenets of interpersonal communication. (JL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED218691

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"Toward a Conversational Analysis of Self Disclosure: A Transactional Approach"

by

Virginia McDermott
and
Deborah Baker

University of Minnesota
373-2617

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 1981 Summer Conference on Conversational Interaction and Discourse Processes, Lincoln Nebraska.

This paper represents an initial effort to conceptualize self-disclosure within a theoretical framework which is compatible with symbolic interactionist assumptions. We suggest that the impact of a self-disclosure is tied to the participants' negotiation of relational claims within the unfolding of the episode. In this essay, the context-specific nature of interpersonal behavior is highlighted, and some broad strokes for examining the contextual constraints are drawn.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Virginia McDermott
Deborah Baker
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS503893

"Toward a Conversational Analysis of Self Disclosure:

A Transactional Approach"

In our field, there are a growing number of scholars who hypothesize that people develop patterns of communication as they converse, and that they use these patterns to coordinate their social and physical behaviors.[1] The suggestion that people use communication in flexible yet strategic ways to accomplish common tasks carries with it the concomitant notion that context is an important influence in the development of communication episodes as the means by which speakers are cued to make meaningful choices from among a range of language alternatives.

Prevailing conceptions of meaning within our discipline suggest that it is emergent, a creation of the social situation, and the product of joint interaction between communicators.[2] The meaning of a message rests in part on its embeddedness within other symbolic acts. To study this perspective requires a paradigm which focuses on the emergent and contextual features of social episodes. The unfolding of a communication episode is a process that results in emergent goals and meanings for the participants. The important middle portion of conversation are often shaped by strategic choices which are optional for the participants.

Frentz and Farrell have developed a paradigm which stipulates key concepts to apply to communicative episodes.[3] They see the typical communicative episode beginning with an "initiation imperative" and concluding with "termination" patterns. They argue that between initiation and termination the episode unfolds in a somewhat patterned way depending

upon such imperatives as agreeing upon what type of "episode will be enacted." But they also emphasize that the "central imperative of an episodic sequence involves strategic development." Strategic development consists of the participants making "communicative choices which are guided by the collective emergent goals of each episode."

If we integrate the Frentz and Farrell paradigm of communicative episodes with the concept of emergent meaning, a useful framework emerges. This framework accounts for how the strategic and emergent nature of goals and meanings relates to the participant's interpretation and negotiation of meaning. It is such a framework we wish to propose for the studying of a particular concept of interpersonal communication which has received much attention in the empirically grounded literature of our field: self disclosure.

SELF-DISCLOSURE: AN OVERVIEW AND PROPOSED DIRECTION

The belief that individuals must self-disclose undergirds much of the literature in interpersonal communication. In fact, it is virtually axiomatic that relationships require self disclosure if they are to grow.[4] Personal mental health as well as "relational mental health" are both grounded in the individual's ability to self disclose to at least one other person.[5] The literature on self disclosure suggests that women disclose more readily than men; certain topics are more likely to come up early in a relationship (in fact, within the first fiteeen minutes of an interaction);[6] and a person's self disclosure history is distinct from that person's actual disclosure in a specific context.[7]

A distinction made by some theorists separates self disclosure from self description. Self description is self-data that an individual

is likely to feel comfortable sharing with one or more persons.[8] Self disclosure refers to information communicated by a person which s/he believes would not be known except through this sharing. Miller and Steinberg suggest a distinction between genuine self disclosure and apparent self disclosure.[9] The former is construed as a personally private act as evidenced by one's reluctance or embarrassment to share it with others, while the latter is the process of sharing information which is not really perceived as private and for which there are few, if any, undesirable consequences.

Despite considerable efforts to examine this central interpersonal construct, the literature on self disclosure does not fulfill the rich promise which the very nature of the topic suggests. We propose that the reason the study of self disclosure has produced so few meaningful results is a consequence of self disclosure research being cast in no discernible theoretical framework, and consequently ignoring basic tenets of interpersonal communication.

Although the field of interpersonal communication is not so unified that we can delineate five or six basic tenets to which all theorists will subscribe, we can enumerate some assumptions to which substantial numbers of theorists would agree.[10] First is the concentration that interpersonal communication should be viewed within a transactional framework. That is, the messages which are exchanged between any two persons in a relationship are dependent upon the mutual interaction of those communicants. Second, the study of communicative behavior requires consideration of context. Third, interpersonal communication suggests the sharing of psychological data which contributes to the growth,

maintenance and/or change of one's self concept.

The current literature on self disclosure seems to ignore many of these tenets. One exception may be the consideration of role variation in influencing self disclosure.[11] Although this does provide a transactional framework, only broad based roles are used to differentiate kinds of self disclosure. And the research provides little or no information about the contribution which a particular friend, family member of acquaintance makes in cueing another's self disclosure.

In an effort to remedy what we see to be some of the weaknesses in the self disclosure literature, we propose considering self disclosure within a broad framework of interpretation and negotiation. To accomplish our task, we (1) cast the concept of self disclosure within the interactive concept of "identity"; (2) explore how self disclosure operates relationally.

SELF DISCLOSURE AND IDENTITY

The concept of identity is grounded in the symbolic interactionist consideration of role.[12] A person's identity is thought to encompass the complex interweaving of social and interpersonal roles which an individual has. A person's role (via the role-taking processes) is cued situationally; the person's identity refers to those enduring aspects of thought and behavior which are exhibited across situations. Scott and Lyman suggest that a role is an identity which is mobilized within a particular situation.[13]

In addition, the concept of identity is viewed as central to the

concept of meaning. Hewitt and Stokes, following McHugh, propose that individuals organize meaning thematically.[14] As the behaviors in any situation unfold, the individual reads the emerging features against the backdrop of previous themes, to fit the emergent features into a known and understood context in order to "make sense" of what is going on. Central to the themes used to organize meanings are identities which have been defined on the basis of conventional social roles and/or interpersonal roles. These roles have been established between the specific interactants over time and in relation to one another. The thematic organization of meaning by specific interactants depends, in large measure, on their ability to interpret each others' actions as a manifestation of particular identities. It follows that when events fail to fit themes, a person's identity may then be called into question. If the acts of another do not appear to make sense, against the backdrop of what is believed to be that person's identity, then, perhaps it is the individual who is not who s/he appears to be. The way in which both self and other come to be known through role taking processes--that I know myself, that others are able to come to know me, and that I can make assumptions about how it is that those others see me, and alter my behavior accordingly--under girds the literature of accounts, situated identities, and disclaimers.[15]

The complex interweaving of role taking processes through which we come to know ourselves and come to be known to others offers a framework within which to view self disclosure which is not inconsistent with some of the reflecting on self disclosure which other writers have done. Rubin, for example, suggests that when we reveal something to another

person of our true self, we must be prepared for the possibility that the other will examine what we reveal and find it wanting.[16] Jouard, too, talks of the accurate portrayal of self to others as a necessary condition for achieving self understanding as well as relational understanding.[17] Perhaps within the literature on self disclosure, the position which is most compatible with the literature on identity is offered by Kaplan who proposes that talking about oneself has no necessary bearing on the development or maintenance of relationships.[18] Rather, he suggests, that what is relevant is how to talk about oneself relates to the other person.

Kaplan's distinction appears to be an interesting and provocative one. His position requires that the information which one shares with another must be grounded in something. We propose, based on the interaction of identity and meaning, that self-data must be grounded in a particular context so that it is incorporated within the particular thematic history of a rleationship, whatever its level of development. The risk which an individual runs in sharing something of his/her self is the risk which is attendant whenever a person speaks in a way which invites a reframing of one's identity by saying something which may be perceived as not "fitting" the basic thematic identity which has been established.

What makes a self-descriptive statement a self-disclosure may well turn on the individual's recognizing the contextual markers which serve to cue the individual that the sharing of a particular type of information at this moment is relevant both to the development of the conversation as well as to the development of the dyad's relational

history. Thus within specific contexts, the notion of theme is tightly bound to the content and style of self-disclosure.

SELF-DISCLOSURE: IDENTITY AND CONTEXT INTERACTIONS

What we are proposing is that individuals anticipate the consequences which their messages may have. Therefore, a person who is making a statement about him/herself is able to recognize that the dyadic partner may view the message in such a way that the identity of the interactant is reframed positively or negatively. Armed with the knowledge of how people "typify," the disclosing individual can couch the disclosure so that interpretation which s/he desires stands the best chance of emerging. The way in which an individual grounds an utterance thematically cues the other as to how to interpret the self disclosure.

Let's assume a couple who are dating. For the sake of the relationship she feels he needs to know that she doesn't make much money. She wants him to understand that the reason she doesn't see more of him is that she can't afford to put out more money per week when they go "dutch treat." Now, of course, she can simply tell him that and let him draw whatever conclusions he wants. But most likely, she will ground her utterance with cues as to how to interpret the self disclosure. She may reason that if she simply shares her meager salary with him, his image of her may be called into question. "What a loser; with all her education you'd think she'd have a better paying job." Or, "oops, here's a gal with no ambition." But if she tells him about her previous position, and how she took a substantial cut in pay to do something she really enjoys "because money isn't everything and life is too short" his image of her may be one of admiration

for a "gutsy lady." So how she tells him what she wants him to know involves a consideration on her part of how we will receive the message and what kind of image she wishes to establish or maintain.

The fact that an individual grounds an utterance in anticipation of another's response raises an interesting question about the nature of self-disclosures and their relationship to context. Are self-disclosures scripted or spontaneous? We propose that self-disclosures may be of either variety, but we hypothesize that scripted self-disclosures may be the norm.

Situations themselves, it seems, provide certain prescriptions about how we are to behave, and one of the prescribed behaviors may well indicate that we are expected to do some self-disclosing of a particular nature. Sensitivity to contextual cues is certainly an important component here. For instance, a person who goes to an A.A. Meeting should understand and respond to the dynamic of that situation and its attendant expectation that one is to disclose something of one's own abuse history, or of one's life with a family member who is alcoholic or drug dependent. In most contexts, this information would not be likely to come within the first several conversations, but the contextual markers of the A.A. meeting prompts immediate sharing. In fact, the expectation communicated is that an unwillingness to disclose at this juncture threatens the helping relationship.

We propose that sensitivity to contextual cues operates in another manner also. Our experience suggests that individuals have scripted histories which they share with one or more persons. These scripted self-disclosures are fitted into the episodic development

of a relational history at junctures which appear appropriate to the discloser. In these cases, we believe that interactants search for contextual cues which they may capitalize on by inserting their script into the dynamic of the episode. These scripts are modified (expanded or contracted) to fit the conversational context as well as the particular previous relational history.

These self disclosures may be seen as an ongoing part of the individual's self-presentation (though they are not necessarily widely shared or "common knowledge"). They constitute a portion of the person's identity, and as such are part of the ongoing life story. As part of the repertoire of episodes which the individual enacts, the discloser may vary the emphases in the story depending on who the cocreator of the episode is, what the nature of the relational history is, or what the conversational cues constrain or suggest.

In sharing something of one's story there are certain scripts which people follow. The individual who wishes to enact a script searches for cues in the conversational train which permit the necessary linkages to be made to introduce the script in a relevant, related fashion. Although the script is fairly well defined, the interpersonally competent person enacts the script flexibly, altering the style to fit the contextual markers, emphasizing or deleting details depending on how the other responds, and based on judgments about how much the other is able to hear. The discloser may well search the unfolding episodes for opportunities to share specific information with another. In other words, in light of the individual's conception of what s/he thinks his/her identity is, as well as the perception s/he thinks the other has of that identity, the individual

alters the script to fit the needs of the particular person.

Certainly, though, some self disclosures are spontaneous. We may even think, later, "I wonder what made me say that!" But, a greater proportion of self-disclosures are probably scripted to some degree and negotiated within the framework of expectations and episodic constraints. What we choose to tell another is in part based on the history of the conversations we have had--the previous themes which we have elaborated; in part based on this conversational history--what we are talking about and how we have talked about it; in part cued by how the partner has responded to earlier disclosures; in part negotiated by how we think we are being seen at this particular moment (e.g. strong when we are feeling vulnerable; angry when we really hurt; etc.). What we know of each other provides us with the material from which to draw analogies and to make metaphors. In fact, many of our scripted self-disclosures may be metaphors such that the telling or not telling, the how of the telling, and the where of the telling may say a great deal about the nature of our relationship.

SELF-DISCLOSURE: IDENTITY AND RELATIONSHIP

Virtually any self-descriptive statement which a person makes which reveals an attitude, feeling, opinion or value judgment has the potential to function as a self-disclosure. Naturally, not all do. However, a subset of such statements do appear to serve as markers, cueing the other that an identity claim (and possible relational change) is being proffered. What are the conditions under which self-descriptive statements are negotiated as identity claims? This section of the paper examines some possible directions that an answer might take. We make no pretense about being exhaustive.

In the conceptual frame which we advance in this essay, a crucial assumption is that the definition of the situation is emergent and negotiable. Consequently, self-descriptive statements are emergent and negotiable as identity claims. Individuals experience situations from particular standpoints within them and respond communicatively based on their understanding of the emergent definition. Our point of view suggests that people work cooperatively to establish communicative settings. The meaning of a message rests not only on knowing what was said but in understanding, at least in part, what might have been said. Both interactants must understand the range of alternatives from which they construct their messages in order to understand what the words should count for.

Implied in this position is a symbolic interactionist assumption that as members of the same speech community we bring similar understandings to the unfolding of episodes about the requirements of shared situations. When we recognize discrepancies between understandings, we are able to reframe or uncover the divergent interpretations. The literature on aligning actions works from this framework of shared background information; so is the concept part of the notion of typifying. What is implied is that for many situations we hold routine expectations about how they should unfold a certain latitude which allows for variations in the unfolding without disrupting our understanding of the episodic framework.

So, for example, a call from a friend to get together for coffee at ten at night may be viewed as routine, but more likely is viewed as outside the latitude of expectations. Both you and your friend recognize (or should recognize) that the request does not fit the

pattern and some accompanying information should be offered. If the friend communicates urgency, but without supplying the specifics, and you agree to meet for coffee, you will search the words and behaviors of your friend for cues as to what this episode is all about. The failure to produce an issue which falls within the latitude of your expectations may alter the identity claim your friend shares with you.

Similarly, when introducing the topic of "what this episode is all about" I may be aware that from your standpoint it might not seem like an issue, and so I may elaborate on why it is an issue for me. Such elaboration acknowledges that I know that you know that I should know the range of situations and behaviors in which I can press our relationship. That is, I should have some shared understanding of the relational claim which exists between us.

We feel that in examining conversations we can, in a straightforward manner, identify the self-descriptive statements which are potential identity claims. Further, we propose that in examining the conversations of interactants we can identify the ways in which they typify the conversational context and within that context make their relational claim. We admit the difficulty inherent in attempting such a move, but we believe the study of conversational exchanges will permit us to say some new things about self-disclosure. Following Kaplan's observation, we propose that the more one's talk about oneself is relationally tied to the other, the greater the likelihood that the message is a self-disclosure. For a self-descriptive statement to impinge on the relationship, the statement must be heard as relationally relevant, and responded to in kind. It is perhaps at this juncture that the critical negotiation

of meaning occurs, however, without further investigation we are not prepared to say so with confidence.

However, we do propose that self-disclosure be examined through the cross partioning of the identity-relationship interaction. That is, based on our previous analysis, we are suggesting that given a particular context with its attendant cues, the self-disclosure of an interactant may be tracked by examining (1) the level of abstraction of a self-descriptive statement and (2) the impact of that statement as an identity claim which can be determined by examining the conversation for cues to the relational claim which the interactants make upon each other.

TRACKING THE IDENTITY TALK

As an initial procedure for characterizing the identity claims we propose the following: (1) That an "I" or "my" statement which reflects an attitude, orientation, opinion or value judgment be treated as a self-descriptive statement; (2) That these self-descriptive statements, once identified, be coded according to the level of abstraction at which the message is cast. If an "I" statement is offered, for example, on the assessment of national divorce trends, this would receive a code of 5 suggesting a statement of the least personal and most abstract nature. A statement which contained an opinion on divorce trends or provided details about people s/he knows who are divorced would be coded a 4. The more personal and least abstract statements, such as "I am divorced, so I know" would be coded a 3. A personal statement which contains some elaboration would be coded a 2, and a personal statement which was fully elaborated would be coded a 1.

For instance, in one conversational exchange, the interactant reveals to the other:

> Ah...I was thinking a little bit ago as far as the traditional roles go...ah...if something should happen to come up, if my wife should discover some ...ah...desire...some...some new talent or something, that she would want to turn into a career, I...ah...really...well...thinking of myself...essentially... the situation we're in now...it would be hard because we've already set this pattern. We already have the children.

This statement would most likely be coded a 2. That is, there is a personal statement, but little elaboration concerning the crux of the statement, "it would be hard because we've already set this pattern."

The coding system proposed here is presented as an initial indicator to serve as a rough approximation in determining the amount of identity talk and the level at which the identity talk is cast. The act of typifying the other can be based on statements at any level of abstraction. In fact, the interactant's judgment that the situation requires "more personal talk" and the partner's continuous use of abstract language may in itself result in a typification.

TRACKING RELATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

One of the most difficult issues to analyze about self-disclosure is the relative impact that it has in a conversation. At what point does an identity claim become a self-disclosure? What is the impact and significance of an identity claim on the relationship?

Conversational strategies appear to cue the interactants about the relational claims which are implied by the episodic unfolding. If conversations are indeed joint products of the interactants who negotiate meanings, then, one of the meanings which they negotiate is

the amount of relational development they will tolerate between them. Conversational strategies such as minimal assent, for example, can in the unfolding of a story, encourage the individual to continue. However, if the minimal assent comes at the end of the relating of the experience, it may cue the other that the comments are being read as only minimally relevant to the relational development. Clearly, in some conversations, relational development would be expected to be minimal.

For instance, in this exchange between two students who were taping a conversation as part of a class assignment:

F. "What am I going to do when I get married? You know...somebody's got to stay home with the kids....if I ever have kids, and I think I will."

M. Well, that's another concept of marriage....is the childless marriage....you know....that's becoming more socially acceptable..."

The male's response to her identity claim was to abstract the conversational theme which suggests that her remarks are to be read as conversationally appropriate. There is nothing in his response to suggest that her remarks are relationally relevant.

Tracking the relational claims suggests that the communicative patterns of the interactants must be examined to understand what conversational cues they provide about how each wants to be heard, and how each is hearing the other. These claims can range from minimal acknowledgement which suggests mutual agreement about some aspect or phase of the conversation to a serious commitment. One conversational strategy worth exploring may be increased use of "we" or "our" following an identity claim. By examining the identity claim within the emergent meaning of the conversation we can track in an exploratory fashion the

relational claim which is being proffered, accepted, ignored or rejected.

As an initial phase in this process we propose using the McDermott and Keller[19] paradigm to track not just the task-related talk but the relational talk as well. The method they use for identifying themes would permit the locating of markers which suggest that interactants understand in similar ways the kinds of topics which should be dealt with in the unfolding of an episode. One such recurring theme might indicate the expectations about relational claims which the interactants perceive as a communicative constraint. The analyzing of themes can serve as a baseline measure of what the relational context appears to prescribe and can be used as a comparison with the dyadic pair's actual response.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing analysis is suggestive rather than conclusive. We have tried to indicate how self-disclosure is contextually grounded. As participants in an episode and members of the same speech community, we are able to typify the unfolding of an interaction. Part of the typification does include self disclosure in certain contexts. By placing self disclosure within the framework of emergent identity, the analysis has proposed a means of understanding how the person, by choosing to disclose, is also indicating something about a role that s/he plays.

Our analysis has tried to illustrate also the interactive nature of the disclosing behavior. In addition to the context cueing self disclosure, the interactants themselves negotiate when and with what

frequency self disclosure occurs. The negotiation is an integral part of the relational development. Some suggestions have been offered concerning the interaction of self disclosure and relational development and a number of avenues of further research are indicated. Further research should continue to help to ground self disclosure in a theoretical framework and remain consistent with some of the fundamental tenents of interpersonal communication.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Donald Cushman arrays a segment of this literature in a draft for the Handbook of Communication, in press.

[2]Thomas P. Wilson details this perspective in "Conceptions of interaction and forms of sociological explanation." American Sociological Review, 35(1970), 697-710. The work of Hewitt and Stokes, "Aligning actions," American Sociological Review, 41(1976), 838-849, is relevant here, as is that of Marvin Scott and Stanford Lyman, "Accounts," American Sociological Review, 33(1968) 46-61; Jack Bilmes, "Rules and rhetoric for negotiating social order in a Thai village," Journal of Anthropological Research, 32(1976), 44-57; and Thomas Frentz and Thomas Farrell, "Language as Action: A paradigm for communication," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 62(1976), 333-349. Thomas Scheff has offered a model of negotiation for situations in which at least one member of a dyad has an understanding of how to define the situation, and, in order for that dyad to cooperate, requires the other dyad member to accept this same definition. See his essay, "Negotiating reality: Notes on power in the assessment of responsibility," in I. Deutscher (ed.), "What We Say/What We Do: Sentiments and Acts (Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1973).

[3]Frentz and Farrell, op.cit.

[4]P. C. Cozby, "Self-disclosure: A literature review." Psychological Bulletin, 79 (1973), 73-91.

[5]S. Jourard. The Transparent Self. (New York: Van Nostrand, 1971).

[6]C. Berger, et al, "Perceptions of information sequencing in relationship development." Human Communication Research, 3(1976), 146-158.

[7]Cozby, op.cit.

[8]S. A. Culbert, "Interpersonal process of self-disclosure: It takes two to see one." (Washington, D.C.: N.T.L. Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, 1967).

[9]G. R. Miller and M. Steinberg. Between People. (Palo Alto, Calif.: Science Research Associates, 1975).

[10]A. Bochner, "On taking ourselves seriously: An analysis of some persistent problems and promising directions in interpersonal research." Human Communication Research, 4 (1978), 179-191. See also, G. R. Miller, "Introduction," in Sage Annual Review (Beverly Hills: Sage Publication, 1976). Vol. 5.

[11] S. Gilbert, "Empirical and theoretical extensions of self-disclosure." in G. R. Miller (ed.) Sage Annual Review of Communication Research, (Beverly Hills: Sage Publication, 1976). Vol. 5.

[12] See Hewitt and Stokes, op.cit. and Scott and Lyman, op.cit. John P. Hewitt, Self and Society (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1976).

[13] Scott and Lyman, op.cit.

[14] Hewitt and Stokes, op.cit.

[15] The work of D. P. Cushman and R. Craig in the Sage Annual Review of Communication Research (Beverly Hills: Sage Publication, 1976). Vol. 5, is relevant here.

[16] Z. Rubin, Liking and Loving (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973).

[17] Jouard, op.cit.

[18] R. E. Kaplan, "Maintaining interpersonal relationships: A bipolar theory," Interpersonal Development, 6(1975), 106-119.

[19] V.A. McDermott and Joyce Keller develop a model in "Toward a theory of negotiating meaning: A rationale and example," at Human Communication Research for review.